

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1 and 25 are amended herein.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-25 are currently pending and under consideration.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3, 25, AND 26 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY TANAKA ET AL. (US 4,337,384)

The present invention as recited in claim 1 (as amended herein), relates to a heater cooker, which comprises a chamber cover. The chamber cover has "a plurality of air distribution ports provided along an edge of the chamber cover to guide the air from the fan chamber..., wherein the plurality of air distribution ports are provided along the edge of the chamber cover to prevent air from being directly forced onto food in the cooking cavity."

Tanaka teaches a cooking appliance of a hot air circulating type, which includes a heating chamber 2. Tanaka teaches that the circulation of air heat by heating means 15 is accomplished by drawing air through inlet perforations 21 in the central area of a partitioning wall 18 and discharging the hot air from a compartment 20 into the heating chamber 2 through outlet perforations 22 provided in the peripheral area of the partitioning wall 18 (see column 3, line 64 – column 4, line 2 and FIG. 3). As the Examiner asserts in item 10, on page 6 of the Office Action, "all of the perforations 22 are not on the edge of the wall 18."

The partitioning wall 18 of Tanaka is not the same as the claimed chamber cover because the partitioning wall 18 is provided with the outlet perforations 22 provided along the entire peripheral area of the wall 18. As the Examiner asserts in item 10, on page 6 of the Office Action, "all of the perforations 22 are not on the edge of the wall 18." Thus, Tanaka teaches away from the claimed invention, which teaches that "the plurality of air distribution ports are *provided along the edge of the chamber cover so that the air is not directly forced onto food in the cooking cavity*" (see claim 1, emphasis added). The outlet perforations 21 of Tanaka allows hot air to be directly forced onto food in the chamber 2, causing the food to be excessively cooked or burnt whereas another part may not be desirably cooked. To this end, the cooking appliance of Tanaka is problematic like the conventional heating cooker as described, for example, in paragraph 0005 of the Applicant's specification. In contrast to Tanaka, the present invention provides the air distribution ports along an edge of the chamber

cover to guide the air from the fan chamber to the edge of the chamber cover to evenly discharge the air to the cooking cavity and prevent direct distribution of hot air to food. It is submitted that Tanaka does not teach or suggest the features as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Similar to claim 1, claim 25 (as amended herein) recites a chamber cover having "a plurality of air distribution ports provided along an edge of the chamber cover to guide hot air discharged from the fan chamber to the edge of the chamber cover to discharge the hot air to the cooking cavity, wherein the plurality of air distribution ports are provided along the edge of the chamber cover so that the air is not directly forced onto food in the cooking cavity." It is submitted that Tanaka also does not teach the features recited in claim 25 of the present invention.

Claims 3 and 26 depend from claims 1 and 25, respectively. For at least the reason that claims 1 and 25 distinguish over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3 and 26 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the objection is overcome.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2, 4-7, 9-14, AND 20-23 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) OVER THE COMBINATION OF REFERENCES

Claims 2, 4-7, 9-14, and 20-23 depend from claim 1. Dependent claims 2, 4-7, 9-14, and 20-23 (depending, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1) recite patentably distinguishing features of their own, and further, are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependency from independent claim 1.

For example, in contrast to Tanaka and McFadden, dependent claim 2 recites, "air distribution ports are defined by a plurality of protuberant parts which are provided along the edge of the chamber cover by protruding predetermined portions of the edge of the chamber cover toward the cooking cavity, so that the protuberant parts form channels directed outward and opened at the edge of the chamber cover." Like Tanaka, McFadden also teaches away from the claimed invention. That is, the Examiner relies on the directing means 26 of McFadden, which provides a direct flow of gas on top of food, causing the food to be excessively cooked or burnt whereas another party may not be desirably cooked. McFadden fails to teach or suggest the features recited in claim 2 of the present invention.

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the objection is overcome.

IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 6-10-05

By: Derrick L. Fields
Derrick L. Fields
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone (202) 434-1500
Facsimile (202) 434-1501